

JUN 20 2007

Application No.: 10/697,641Docket No.: 200309346-2 (1509-452)**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 -- 24 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-11, 14-24 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Douglas (US PG PUB No. 20040049693). In response, independent claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 21 and 23 have been amended and are believed to be patentably distinguishable from Douglas for the reasons discussed below.

The present invention is solving a very different problem than Douglas. Douglas's intention is to protect the network in machines by detecting and filtering information about attack events. And regards network security the present invention is about collection and storing events from multiple devices and sending them to a central database to analyze the event. The present invention is not just security related, but is applicable to all offense. In Douglas, because the system is concerned with detecting intrusion quickly, the event logs are filtered as stated in Douglas [0004] "(b) passing the event data to a plurality of configured modules on the host computer, in serial fashion, that alter the contents of the event data that is to be reported to form filtered event data or that discard the event not considered of value to report; and (c) passing all the filtered event data to a second plurality of configured modules for providing notification of the intrusion or intrusion attempts."

Independent claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 21 and 23 have been amended to emphasize that the entirety of events are analyzed since the last analysis of the local event logs. For least these reasons, the independent claims should be patentable over Douglas. Dependent claims to 2 - 6, 8 - 9, 11, 13, 15 - 16, 18 - 20, 21 - 22 and 24

Application No.: 10/697,641**Docket No.: 200309346-2 (1509-452)**

recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable over Douglas for the reasons discussed with respect to the independent claims as well as on their own merits.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas in view of Katz et al. (US PG PUB No. 200 20062259). In response, claim 12 has been amended and is believed to be patentable over this combination of references for the reasons discussed below.

Katz does not overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Douglas. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the reasons advanced with respect to why these two references can be combined. These two references are from completely different environments and are from non-analogous arts. Further, Katz merely monitors and detects new devices added to the network as opposed to running analysis of events and providing alerts based on these events. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Application No.: 10/697,641

Docket No.: 200309346-2 (1509-452)

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: June 20, 2007
KMB/cac